REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-25, and 27-32 are pending. Claims 2 and 26 are cancelled. No claims are amended herein.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum and further in view of Booth. Applicant respectfully submits that Pallman in view of Blum and further in view of Booth does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ...accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 16-22 and 24 depend from

independent Claim 15, and Claims 27-30 and 32 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." By contrast, Pallman only discloses a method and apparatus for data communication (e.g., data acquisition and delivery). The Pallman reference teaches that modular software may be utilized to acquire/retrieve source data, deliver data to a target, or to perform processing of source data (see Abstract and column 27, lines 33-54). However, the Pallman reference is silent a teaching or suggestion readable on the schedule of protocol transformations that define the Applicants method for controlling remote systems as is recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25. More specifically, the Pallman reference does not show or suggest: (1) transmitting a Hypertext Transfer Protocol command without File Transfer Protocol components over the Internet; and after the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command has been forwarded over the Internet (2) processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the command to a remote system.

In fact, nowhere in the Pallman reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 15 and 25.

Blum et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman noted above. Blum et al. alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Blum et al. only discloses a transparent proxy server that facilitates the establishment of data communications between devices (see Abstract). The Blum et al. reference teaches that a transparent proxy application listening on a predetermined port may receive requests in the native protocol of the request and may operate to establish the requested communication (column 3, lines 42-58). Moreover, Blum et al. discloses that it is known in the art that an "encapsulation routine" may encapsulate an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmit the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58 – 65). The server

may then "strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode" (column 1, lines 58 – 67). By contrast, the Applicants' method as recited in Claims 1, 15, and 25 requires that commands be transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components and be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' claims. Consequently, Pallman either alone or in combination with Blum et al. simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 15 and 25.

Booth does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman and Blum noted above. Booth alone or in combination with Pallman and Blum does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Moreover, it should be appreciated that the system of data transmission that is employed by Booth is incompatible with that suggested by the proposed combination of Pallman and Blum.

Booth discloses a method and apparatus for compressing hypertext transfer protocol messages. The Examiner contends that Booth teaches a transmission system that employs a

transmission of "Hypertext Transfer Protocol Without File Transfer Protocol" and that processes "the Hypertext Transfer Protocol into File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation...". By contrast, as discussed above, the transmissions executed as a part of the Blum system's operation involve an encapsulation of FTP commands using an "encapsulation routine" that encapsulates an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmits the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58 – 65). As disclosed in Blum, the server may then "strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode" (column 1, lines 58 – 67). Therefore the imposition of a scheme such as is disclosed by Booth (where a Hypertext Transfer Protocol command is processed into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation) into the system of Blum that relies on the encapsulation and de-encapsulation of File transfer protocol commands would destroy a essential principle of operation of the Blum system, and thus would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Moreover, Booth does not remedy the deficiencies of Pallman and Blum as it relates to teaching or suggesting the schedule of protocol transformations delimited in the claims. As noted above neither Palllman nor Blum teaches: (1) transmitting a Hypertext Transfer Protocol command without File Transfer Protocol components over the Internet; and after the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command has been forwarded over the Internet (2) processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the command to a remote system. It should be appreciated that Booth discloses that translations of commands from one protocol to the other occur before they are input to a

browser. By contrast, Applicants Claim 1 delimits transformations that occur after a command is transmitted over the Internet. This aspect of the Applicants claims are nowhere taught or suggested in the Booth reference. Consequently, Booth either alone or in combination with Pallman and Blum et al. does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 15 and 25.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 15 and 25 and as such, Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 16-22 and 24 dependent on Claim 15, and Claims 27-30 and 32 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 3-9, 11, 13 and 14, 16-22 and 24, and 27-30 and 32 respectively overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 10, 23 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Blum et al. and Booth and further in view of Bowman-Amuah. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Pallman, Blum et al., Booth and Bowman-Amuah references, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 10, 23 and 31.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for

controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ...accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 1, Claim 23 depends from independent Claim 15, and Claim 31 depends from independent Claim 25 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

Bowman-Amuah does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman, Blum and Booth noted above. Bowman-Amuah alone or in combination with Pallman, Blum and Booth does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the step of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Bowman-Amuah only discloses a method for providing communication services

over a computer network. Nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Bowman-Amuah, Pallman, Blum, and Booth either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the Applicants' method for controlling a remote system over the Internet as is recited in Claims 1 and 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum et al., Bowman-Amuah and Booth, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25, and thus Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum et al., Bowman-Amuah and Booth do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 10 dependent on Claim 1, Claim 23 dependent on Claim 15, and Claim 31 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 10, 23 and 31 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Blum and Booth and further in view of Sridhar et al. Applicant respectfully submits that the Pallman, Blum, and Booth and Sridhar et al. references, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention as is recited in Claims 12.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ...accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claim 12 depends from independent Claims 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

Sridhar et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman, Blum and Booth noted above. Sridhar et al. alone or in combination with Pallman, Blum and Booth does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Sridhar et al. only discloses an enhanced network communication system where client and server communications systems are coupled over a data network. Nowhere in the

Sridhar et al. reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol components be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman, Blum, Booth and Sridhar et al., either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the Applicants' invention as it is set forth in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum, Booth and Sridhar et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and thus Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman, Blum, Booth and Sridhar et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 12 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claim 12 overcomes the Examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 10/4, 2004

Reginald A. Ratliff

Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060